

document to be discussed for the Sept. 23, 2009 shoreline meeting

From: **Chestine Edgar** (c_edgar2@yahoo.com)

Sent: Wed 9/23/09 2:48 PM

To: c_edgar2@yahoo.com

RECEIVED

SEP 23 2009

Hi,

CITY OF BURIEN

I have some very serious concerns about a number of the areas that are covered in the document to be reviewed. These areas need to have further definition, explanation or discussion on the implications on the legal impacts of the written language.

1. In the meeting recap as well as in other parts of the document, there are refers to to tax-titled properties. There is no definition given for these in the body of the document or in the definitions section. This term needs to be defined.
2. In the table area;
aquaculture was discussed only for recreational use. In the current table, aquaculture can now be done on a commercial level. I cannot believe that residential properties on the Sound or in Lake Burien are willing to have commerical aquaculture cages (such as fish cages) right off of their property, boat mooring buoys should not be considered for Lake Burien or at least someone should discuss whether this chart use could result in extra boat mooring bouys in the lake, commerical office space is not welcome for Lake Burien which is residential in nature and current zoning. Also I believe that the residential properties on the Sound would not appreciate commerical office space that can be up to 35 ft. in their neighborhoods. Yes, there are some single family residences that have a small business in their homes but this is not the same as the impact as a 35 ft. commerical office space. However, once this is allowed in the chart and the document, someone can request a re-zone of residential space and use the argument that this is allowed in the Shoreline document. It also flies in the intent of the document that less expanded, intense land use is better for the shoreline.
Why would we be welcoming large commerical office spaces on Lake Burien's, Shorewood's or Three Tree Point's Shoreline?
commerical recreation appears to have more rights about shoreline use than single family residential. Why is that? There needs to be some discussion or examples about what that
SDP in the aquatic zone would mean for commerical recreation and what it would actually allow.
The SDP and the CU needs better definition in the actual document and there should be a page reference to where they are in depth discussed in the table.
2. page IV-5(2f.) there is a discussion about compensatory mitigation within the watershed will be allowed or authorized. Does this mean that we will allow destruction of wetlands (as in the Third Runway situation) and allow them to be mitigated/restored miles away form the actual wetland area. So wetlands in Burien were destroyed and moved to Auburn as the mitigation. I am not certainly willing to allow that to happen again. It had devastating cvnsequences for both bird and animal populations.
3. page IV-7, critical areas 1a and 2c- There is a discussion here and through the document about the Shoreline Administrator. Is this a new city position that is going to be created and what right do citizens have for input about this position? Currently this appears to be an appointment position controlled by Scott

Greenberg? Also in 2c why is there no regulation statement about intrusion on critical freshwater habitats?

4. Perhaps the most disturbing part of this document is the Public Access section on Regulations page IV-10. This whole section looks like a massive land grab on the part of the city under the disguise of this shoreline management plans

b. What the heck does this mean? If you have a corner lot or street end property, the city has the right to take it over in the name of eminent domain for public access-you do not have the right to sell it? Again what does tax titled mean and where are a list of properties that fit this description? Should not the owners have the right to know that their properties are under consideration for this land take over by the city? Should'nt they have the right to provide input to this committee? I have never heard of this kind of take over of property before.

d. again what kind of road are they talking about and should'nt property owners that are going to be affected by this have the right to know that this kind of land take over is going to happen-there are properties in Shorewood as well as on Lake Burien that will be affected by this?

e. This is an attack directed aimed at a number of properties on Lake Burien. First off the majority residents of Lake Burien did not want their property rezoned to 7200 sq. ft. They considered the land around the lake to be a critical area and wanted to stay at 12,000-like Shorewood. That is why a number of them have not sold off to allow that kind of development. Now the city wants to intensively develop the land and in addition gain public access without having to buy or pay for it. No on Mercer Island or Bellevue would allow this demand that when you put up 5 homes you automatically have to give the city a public access to your waterfront. There are at least 5 properties that this is directed at. What happened to the respect for private ownership?

i. j. and k also raise some real concerns for well as the utility easement becoming public access areas. There are some properties in Shorewood that would be surprised that their lands now have public easements across them.

There are serious concerns about the buffer zones and people having to tear up their existing lawns. Also the conditions of the required restorations raise red flags.

There is a mention of a Director on page IV-12-who is this player?

The information about Lake Burien and water quality raises issues about which study and what data.

I have a number of other items but am running out of time.

The table at the back has a lot of unanswered questions that are not filled in.

Thanks for your time

Sincerely,

Chestine Edgar